



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Yosemite National Park
P.O. Box 577
Yosemite, California 95389

IN REPLY REFER TO:
L7617 (YOSE)

APR 05 2004

Memorandum

To: Marty Nielson/Bill Hunsaker
From: Superintendent, Yosemite National Park
Subject: Categorical Exclusion for Project Number 2004-052
Y4-0428 Curry Village- Repair Bath Cabin Rock Fall Damage

Your proposed project is an action that has been determined to result in no measurable environmental effects. It is therefore Categorically Excluded from further National Environmental Policy Act analysis under the category: DO12 3.4.C.04, *Routine maintenance and repairs to cultural resource sites, structures, facilities, utilities, grounds under an approved Historic Structures Preservation Guide or Cyclic Maintenance Guide (or equivalent guides); or if the action would not adversely affect the cultural resource.*

Necessary compliance coordination has been completed with regards to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Endangered Species Act. This project clearance is valid under the condition that you adhere to the conditions stated in the attached environmental screening form and XXX (when attached) when implementing this project.

On the basis of the environmental impact information in the statutory compliance file, with which I am familiar, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No exceptional circumstances or conditions in Section 3-6 apply, and the action is fully described in Section 3-4 of DO-12.

Michael J. Tollefson

4/1/04

Date

cc: Statutory compliance file
Enclosure (2)

Environmental Screening Form**I. Project Information****Project Title:** Y4-0428 Curry Village- Repair Bath Cabin Rock Fall Damage**Project Manager:** Marty Nielson/Bill Hunsaker**Division:** Business & Revenue Management**PMIS #:** N/A**Start Date:** 12/25/2003**Completion Date:** 8/31/2004**Location:** Yosemite Valley**Brief Project Description:**

Repair damage to structures in Curry Village caused by falling rocks. Majority of damage was restricted to roof holes and broken windows, but some damage was done to single rooms that includes bathroom fixtures, electrical fixtures, and floor and wall damage. Work will replace damaged members with in-kind materials in all locations.

Planning and Compliance Background (If box checked, then YES):

- ☐ Has compliance already been completed?
Provide name of compliance document, compliance tracking number, and date of signature:
- ☐ Is this project explicitly called for in a completed (not draft) park planning document?
Indicate which plan:
Provide page number(s) from the plan which reference this project:
Is this project still consistent with the approved plan? (If NO, prepare EA/EIS)
- ☐ Does this project require consultation with any federal, state, local agency, or tribes?
Provide name of agency and dates consulted:
- ☐ Must a Wilderness Minimum Requirement Analysis be completed?
Date received from PM by Planning and Compliance:

II. National Environmental Policy Act Checklist

Does the proposed project potentially (If box checked, then YES):

- ☐ Adversely impact public health and safety?
- ☐ Adversely impact historic or cultural resources, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains, ecologically critical areas, or Natural Landmarks?
- ☐ Have highly controversial environmental effects?
- ☐ Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown risks?

Environmental Screening Form

- ☐ Establish a precedent for future actions resulting in significant environmental effects?
- ☐ Relate directly to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?
- ☐ Involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources?
- ☐ Adversely affect properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?
- ☐ Adversely impact a species listed or proposed to be listed as Federally threatened, endangered or adversely impact designated critical habitat for these species?
- ☐ Violate any federal, state, local or tribal laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment, such as Executive Order 11098 (Floodplains Management) or Executive Order 11090 (Protection of Wetlands) or Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act or Wilderness Act?
- ☐ Have a disproportionate, significant adverse effect on low-income or minority populations?
- ☐ Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of non-native invasive species?
- ☐ Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of federally listed noxious weeds?
- ☐ Require a permit from a federal, state, or local agency to proceed, unless the agency from which the permit is required agrees that a CE is appropriate?
- ☐ Have the potential for significant impact as indicated by a federal, state, or local agency or Indian Tribe?
- ☐ Have the potential to be controversial because of disagreement over possible environmental effects?
- ☐ Have the potential to violate the NPS Organic Act by impairing park resources or values?
- ☐ Restrict access to, and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites?

NEPA Comments/Conditions:

If any of the above exceptions apply, the project cannot be Categorical Excluded and an EA or an EIS is required.

Environmental Screening Form**III. YNP Checklist**

Does the project contribute to measurable impacts on (If box checked, then YES):

- ☐ Geologic resources (i.e. Soils, Bedrock, Streambeds, etc.)?
- ☐ Air quality?
- ☐ Soundscape (i.e. Increase Noise, Affect Natural Sounds)?
- ☐ Water quality/quantity or streamflow characteristics?
- ☐ Types and levels of land use, including occupancy, income, values, and/or ownership?
- ☐ Unique ecosystems?
- ☐ Unique, important fish/wildlife or their habitats?
- ☐ Visitor experience or aesthetic resources (i.e. Supply, Demand, Visitation Activities, etc.)?
- ☐ Socioeconomics, including employment, occupation, income changes, tax base and/or infrastructure?
- ☐ Energy resources?
- ☐ Gateway communities?
- ☐ Long term management of resources or land resources productivity?
- ☐ Pollution Prevention (greening of the parks)?
- ☐ Other important environmental resources (e.g., geothermal, paleontological, or night skies)?

YNP Comments/Conditions:

If any of the above exceptions apply, the project cannot be Categorically Excluded and an EA or an EIS is required.

IV. Special Status Species Checklist

Within the area of potential impact, are there any (If box checked, then YES):

- ☒ Species of special concern? (Federal or State)
Multiple Federal and State species of concern exist in Yosemite Valley; no impact anticipated.
- ☒ Proposed or listed threatened or endangered species? (Federal or State)
Bald eagle (transient), American peregrine falcon, Willow flycatcher, Sierra Nevada red fox exist in Yosemite Valley; no impact anticipated.
- ☒ Park rare plants or vegetation?
Multiple park rare plants and vegetation exist in Yosemite Valley; no impact anticipated.
- ☒ Potential habitats for the special-status species listed above?
No impact anticipated.

Special Status Species Comments/Conditions:

Limit project activity to previously disturbed areas. Limit disruption of vegetation. Stage materials on previously disturbed surface.

Environmental Screening Form**V. National Historic Preservation Act Checklist**

Does the proposed project (If box checked, then YES):

- ☒ Entail ground disturbance?*
- Rock fall on deck of cabin 60A/B is angular boulder size granite that penetrated the ground. Repair may entail digging to bury the boulder rather than remove it.
- ☒ Have any archeological or ethnographic sites within the area of potential effect?*
- Site CA-MRP-0730/H. Within the Yosemite Valley Archaeological District boundary, but not yet listed.
- ☒ Entail alteration of a historic structure or a cultural landscape?*
- Repairs to buildings in Camp Curry Historic District
- ☒ Has a National Register form been completed?*
- Camp Curry Historic Site; Yosemite Valley Historic District
- ☒ Are there any structures on the List of Classified Structures in the area of potential effect?*
- Camp Curry up Duplex Cabins w/Baths: 90A/B LCS#204177; 60A/B #250129; 63A/B #250206; 64A/B #250232; 80A/B # 250354; 72A/B #250389; 73A/B #250405; 74A/B #250421; 80A/B #250540; 90A/B250740

*If yes, then a XXX must be completed

NHPA Comments/Conditions:

Remove large boulder from porch of 60A rather than bury in place to avoid archaeological deposits. Coordinate structural repair with site inspections and project plan reviews with park historic architect (379-1011) and park heritage structure preservation team lead (379-1220).

VI. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Checklist

Does the proposed project (If box checked, then YES):

- ☒ Fall within a wild and scenic river corridor? Merced River
- ☐ Fall within the bed and banks AND will it effect the free-flow of the river?
- If Yes, WSRA Section 7 determination required**
- ☐ Have the possibility of affecting water quality of the area?
- ☒ Remain consistent with its river segment classification (Wild, Scenic, or Recreational - MRP p. 39)?
- Recreational
- ☒ Protect and enhance ORVs (Scientific, Scenic, Geologic Processes/Conditions, Recreational, Biological, Cultural, Hydrologic Processes [i.e. Water Quality, Unique Wetlands]) on a segment-wide basis (refer to Fig. 2 in the MRP - p. 43)?
- Recreational
- ☐ Fall within the River Protection Overlay (MRP p. 99-101)?
- ☐ Remain consistent with conditions of the River Protection Overlay (MRP p. 53)?
- ☒ Remain consistent with Managment Zoning (MRP p. 99-101)?
- 3B+, Visitor Base and Lodging
- ☐ Fall on a tributary to a Wild and Scenic River?
- ☐ Will the project invade (encroach or intrude upon) a Wild and Scenic River corridor?
- ☐ Will the project unreasonably diminish scenic, recreational, or fish and wildlife values?

WSRA Comments/Conditions:

Environmental Screening Form**VII. NEPA Analysis And Approval Conditions**

The project meets the terms and conditions of a categorical exclusion to NEPA.

Applicable Categorical Exclusion:

DO12 3.4.C.04 Routine maintenance and repairs to cultural resource sites, structures, facilities, utilities, grounds under an approved Historic Structures Preservation Guide or Cyclic Maintenance Guide (or equivalent guides); or if the action would not adversely affect the cultural resource.

Conditions:

Remove large boulder from porch of 60A rather than bury in place to avoid archaeological deposits. Coordinate structural repair with site inspections and project plan reviews with park historic architect (379-1011) and park heritage structure preservation team lead (379-1220). Limit project activity to previously disturbed areas. Limit disruption of vegetation. Stage materials on previously disturbed surface.

This project has been reviewed in accordance with the above criteria and it has been determined that the project will result in no or minimal environmental effects. Therefore, it is Categorically Excluded from further environmental review required under the National Environmental Policy Act. Additionally, the necessary compliance coordination has been completed with regards to the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the Endangered Species Act.

Ann Dolmage 3-23-04
Compliance Specialist Date

Monica A. Brown 3/30/04
Compliance Program Manager Date

Prepared by:

Ann Dolmage

With information from:

Bill Hunsaker/Don Evans

Bill Hunsaker 4/1/04
Chief, Project Management Date

PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT FORM (YOSE-XXX)**A. DESCRIPTION OF UNDERTAKING****Project Title:** Y4-0428 Curry Village- Repair Bath Cabin Rock Fall Damage**Project Manager:** Marty Nielson/Bill Hunsaker**Start Date:** 12/25/2003**Completion Date:** 8/31/2004**Location:** Yosemite Valley**Description:**

Repair damage to structures in Curry Village caused by falling rocks. ^{includes} Majority of damage was restricted to roof holes and broken windows, but some damage was done to single rooms that bathroom fixtures, electrical fixtures, and floor and wall damage. Work will replace damaged members with in-kind materials in all locations.

Attachments:

☐ Drawings ☐ Maps ☐ Specifications ☐ Photographs ☐ Site Plan

Other:

B. DESCRIPTION OF EFFECTS**1. Has the area of potential effects been surveyed to identify cultural resources?**

☒ Yes ☐ No

Reference: Curry Village Historic Site Nomination Form; Yosemite Valley Historic District Nomination Form; Yosemite Valley Archaeological District Nomination Form; Site Record for CA-MRP-0753/H.

☒ **Check here if known cultural resources will be affected**

If the area has been disturbed in the past, please attach additional sheets to describe the nature, extent, and intensity of disturbance

2. Affected Resource(s):

Camp Curry Duplex Cabins w/Baths: 90A/B LCS#204177; 60A/B #250129; 63A/B #250206; 64A/B #250232; 80A/B # 250354; 72A/B #250389; 73A/B #250405; 74A/B #250421; 80A/B #250540; 90A/B250740.
Site Record for CA-MRP-0753/H.

PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT FORM (YOSE-XXX)**3. The proposed action will (check as many as apply):**

- ☐ Destroy, remove, or alter features/elements from a historic structure
- ☒ Replace historic features/elements in kind
- ☐ Add nonhistoric features/elements to a historic structure
- ☐ Alter or remove features/elements of a historic setting or environment (including terrain)
- ☐ Add nonhistoric features/elements (including visual, audible, or atmospheric) to a historic setting or cultural landscape
- ☒ Disturb, destroy, or make archeological resources inaccessible, or alter terrain
- ☐ Disturb, destroy, or make ethnographic resources inaccessible, or alter terrain
- ☒ Potentially affect presently unidentified cultural resource
- ☐ Begin or contribute to deterioration of historic fabric, terrain, setting, landscape elements, or archeological or ethnographic resources
- ☐ Involve a real property transaction (exchange, sale, or lease of land or structures)
- ☐ Other:

4. Measures to prevent or minimize loss or impairment of historic/prehistoric fabric, setting, integrity or data:**5. Supporting Study Data (attach if feasible; if action is in a plan, give name and project or page number):****6. Additional Attachments (if needed):**

- ☐ Drawings ☐ Maps ☐ Photographs ☐ Site Plan ☐ Sample ☐ List of Materials
- ☐ Other:

Checklist Preparer

Jeannette Simons

Date

3-22-04

PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT FORM (YOSE-XXX)**C. SPECIALIST SECTION**

SPECIALISTS: Your comments here (or attached) show that you have reviewed this proposal for conformity with requirements of Section 106, with the 1995 Servicewide PA (if applicable), and applicable parts of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation, the NPS Management Policies, and the NPS Cultural Resource Management Guideline, and have given your best professional advice about this project and the issues relevant to the Section 106 process, including identification and evaluation of historic properties and further consultation needs.

☒ **Archeologist** Name: Laura Kirn

Date: 3/22/04

Comments: My understanding is that ground disturbance (proposed) is confined to the deck area of 60 A/B. Given proximity to MRP-534 and general sensitivity of Curry Village, I recommend avoiding excavating a hole for boulder lowering—instead, remove boulder to adjacent area.

Ground Disturbance Not Involved? ☐

Assessment of Effect:

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Avoid ground disturbance (proposed) @ 60 A/B. If not, archeological monitoring will be required.

Signature of Archeologist:

Laura Kirn

☐ **Cultural Anthropologist** Name:

Date:

Comments:

Assessment of Effect:

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Signature of Cultural Anthropologist:

☒ **Curator**

Name: DAVE FORGANO

Date: 4/08/04

Comments:

Assessment of Effect:

No adverse effect for structure

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Signature of Curator:

Dave Forgano

PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT FORM (YOSE-XXX)☐ **Historian**

Name:

Date:

Comments:

Assessment of Effect:

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Signature of Historian: _____

☒ **Historical Architect**

Name: PAUL CHATTEY

Date: 3-22-04

Comments: NO Adverse Effect for Historic Architecture

Assessment of Effect:

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Signature of Historical Architect: _____

☐ **Historical Landscape Architect** Name:

Date:

Comments:

Assessment of Effect:

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

Signature of Historical Landscape Architect: _____

☒ **Preservation Specialist**

Name: CRAIG STRUBLE

Date: 3-23-04

Comments:

Assessment of Effect: NO ADVERSE EFFECT

Recommendations for conditions or stipulations:

SITE VISITS TBA TO INSPECT
INTERIOR WALL & WINDOW TREATMENTS

Signature of Preservation Specialist: _____

PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT FORM (YOSE-XXX)**D. PARK 106 COORDINATOR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Review by specialists: The appropriate subject-matter experts for reviewing the project are indicated in check-off boxes in the Specialist Section.

- ☐ *The foregoing assessment is adequate: proposed action is consistent with all applicable NPS Management Policies, standards, guidelines, or USDI Standards/Guidelines, Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings or others and incorporates measures to avoid Adverse Effects.*

Reviewed and Accepted By:

Name: *Wicki S. L. Neuh* Date: *3-23-04*

Title: Chief of Resources Division

2. Assessment of Effect: No Adverse Effect

3. Compliance Requirements The following is the park's assessment of Section 106 process needs and requirements for this undertaking

☐ **A. Standard 36 CFR Part 800 Consultation**

Consultation under 36 CFR is needed subsequent to preparation and review by appropriate cultural resource management advisors of this form.

☒ **B. Undertaking related to 1995 NPS Programmatic Agreement**

The above action meets all conditions for a programmatic exclusion under Stipulation IV of the 1995 NPS programmatic agreement.

Exclusion Number: IVB(9)

☐ **C. Plan-Related Undertaking**

Consultation and review of the proposed undertaking were completed in the context of a plan review process, in accordance with the 1995 NPS programmatic agreement and 36 CFR Part 800.

☐ **D. Undertaking Related to Another Agreement**

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under a document such as a statewide agreement written in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.7 or counterpart regulations.

Agreement:

☐ **E. Flood-Recovery Related Undertaking**

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under the letter-based agreement between the NPS, the State Historic Preservation Office and the Council for Historic Preservation for Highwater 97 flood repair and recovery.

☒ **F. Undertaking Related to 1999 Yosemite Programmatic Agreement**

The proposed undertaking is covered for Section 106 purposes under the park's 1999 programmatic agreement for planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance; the undertaking meets the stipulations identified in Article VII.C.2.

Agreement: VII C(2)

4. Stipulations/Conditions

- ☒ Following are listed any stipulations or conditions necessary to ensure that the assessment of effect above is consistent with 36 CFR Part 800 criteria of effect or to mitigate potential adverse effects.

- 1) Remove large boulder from path rather than leaving in place to avoid archaeological impacts*
- 2) Coordinate structural repair w/ site inspections and project plan reviewed with park historic architect and consult with State Historic Preservation*

PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT FORM (YOSE-XXX)**Recommended by Park Section 106 coordinator**Name: **Jeannette Simons**Title: **Historic Preservation Officer**Date: March 23, 2004Signature: Jeannette Simons**E. SUPERINTENDENT'S APPROVAL**

The proposed work conforms to NPS Management Policies and NPS-28 and I approve the recommendations, stipulations, or conditions noted in Section B of this form.

Signature of Superintendent: W. H. H. H.Date: 4-1-04